



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

that was going to be tried, and persecuted, and exterminated, only just for trying to keep their religion from being insulted by the firebrands. So when he was tired, says he, 'Now go down every one of you,' says he, 'man, woman, and child,' says he, 'and stand by the poor fellows that's going to be persecuted and svore against by the firebrands, says he. So, sure enough, when I got to the courthouse, there was a thousand people there anyway. And there was Mr. Foley, the lawyer, from Dublin, come down to defend the boys.'

"And who paid for him coming?" said Jem.

"Why," said Pat, "Father John sent round his servant, and two or three of his head men, to all the Catholic shopkeepers and tradesmen in Kilcommon, and made them all subscribe their pounds, and ten shillings, and five shillings; and I heard tell they liked it little enough, but they were mostly all afraid to bring Father John's tongue on them in the chapel; only Mr. Nulty and one or two more that never cares what Father John can say. Well, the readers told their story mighty fair and clever, and then Mr. Foley got up and examined them, to make them confess they were insulting the people, and he fetched out a tract, and asked them did they give any of that; and they said they did a few; and then he read out a place where it said the priests was harrassing the people for their dues. And then he made a great speech entirely to the magistrates, and said, what wonder what would happen to them, when they were insulting the people and their religion like that?"

"And did he make out they were insulting their religion any other way?" said Jem.

"No then he didn't," said Pat, "but he thought that the greatest insult at all."

"Well, then, I'm thinking," said Jem, "he got his story from Father John, for it's he that would think that the greatest insult entirely. But sure the people of Kilcommon is greatly changed this ten years back, if they think the like of that is an insult to them. Don't I remember, just ten years ago, when the people was fairly riz for the Priest's Tariff, as they called it, up the country? And wasn't the boys of Kilcommon just going to rise for it too, and had it all settled among them, and the day fixed, and all the boys bound to pay only the dues allowed in the Tariff for christening, and marriages, and everything else? And didn't Father John and the rest get up a great meeting for Repale, to put the boys off it, and promised to get them the country for themselves, and all kinds of things? and hadn't they fifty priests at it? and wasn't that the way the monster meetings for the Repale come about, where all the boys was expecting to get the word at last to take Ireland for themselves? And a mighty cute and clever job it was of Father John and the rest, for it put the people off the Tariff entirely." But sure the people of Kilcommon is greatly changed if they are so easy hurt at a word agen the dues. But if Father John taught the lawyer his story, sure it's all plain enough."

"Well, that was all the insult they had, any way," said Pat, "and then Mr. Owens got up, and said there was only a dozen of that tract given out, and that he stopped it when he heard Father John took offence, and never gave any more; and if anything else was insulting, he'll stop it too. And when the lawyer was done, the gentlemen said there was no law for stoning people for the like of that, and they would have to find the boys guilty, just as if they stoned anybody else. So then the lawyer asked the gentleman only to put a fine on the boys, and whatever it was it would be paid. And while I was wondering where the like of them would get the money, I turned round, and saw Father John with his roll of bank notes out in his hand."

"Ay," said Jem, "I seen that myself, after the work at the election last summer, when Father John paid down the money in open court for every one of the boys that was fined for the work—and bad work it was. But did the magistrates let them off with a fine?"

"Deed, didn't they," said Pat, "this time. Old Mr. Everards says, just as quiet and easy as you please—'It's a month's imprisonment and labour we're going to give them,' says he. And I never seen Father John look so mad, for he wasn't going to stand *that* for the boys. Still it's a pretty good thing they made of it; for all their wives and children got new clothes, and meal, and money, and what not."

"And isn't that the decent way for Father John to be defending his religion?" said Jem; "didn't the Rev. Mr. Owens write him a letter, asking him to settle who was right, by fair discussion, before the people? But Father John would rather get his religion defended with stones and mud, by the blackguards that never comes to confession at all: and doesn't all that show who knows that he has fair reason on his side?"

"Well, Jem," said Pat, "I am coming to think more and more that the priests hasn't reason on their side, and that they know, that once it comes to fair argument,

the people will find out that. But as I was going home I fell in with Mr. Owens, and had a talk with him. And, says he, 'Why wouldn't we be stoned,' says he, 'when the blessed Apostles was stoned in almost every place they went to preach in?' says he, and with that he pulled out his Bible, and showed me two places where the Apostles was stoned for speaking to the people; and another place where the Jews gathered up all 'the wicked men of the vulgar sort, and made a tumult, and set the city on an uproar,' just for all the world the way Father John does now, 'and so it's no new thing,' says he, 'but we must follow the way the Blessed Apostles went.'

"But, your reverence," says I, "what can poor men, like the likes of us, do, when the priest can get up the like of that agin any of us, and maybe put us out of our work too? How can we stand up for the Bible at all? And with that he took out his Bible again (and it was a Douay Bible too), and he read these words, that came harder on me than any words that ever I read in the Bible;" and Pat took out his Douay Bible and read the place (Mark viii. 38)—"For he that shall be ashamed of me and of my words, in this adulterous and sinful generation, the Son of Man also will be ashamed of him, when he shall come in the glory of the Father, with the Holy Angels." 'And now,' says he, 'are you ashamed to stand up for the word of the Son of God, and will you make him be ashamed to stand up for you?' So I couldn't tell what to say at all, and I can't get them words out of my mind; and what will I do at all?"

So if ever we hear of what they did, we will tell it to our readers.

LATRIA, HYPERDULIA, DULIA.

A PROUD clergyman of the Established Church, in the west of Ireland, once showed us a scapular that had been presented to him by one of his parishioners who had seceded from the Church of Rome and joined his congregation, on which were embossed, in rude embroidery, three figures, representing, as he stated, Joseph, Jesus, and Mary, on a small heart of cloth, which, for seven years, the individual in question had worn round his neck as a charm, and worshipped, under the impression that Joseph, Jesus, and Mary were the holy and ever-blessed Trinity. We cannot take upon us to state from what source he obtained this scapular, whether from his parish priest or some itinerant Jesuit, who traded on his simplicity; nor should we think it needful to notice such cases of ignorance and superstition, if we did not believe that thousands of such cases exist in our unfortunate country, and that no exertion is made, on the part of either the Roman Catholic priesthood or hierarchy, to disabuse the minds of the people from such delusions. While examining the subject of indulgences, which we can assure our readers we have not lost sight of, with a view to bringing forward some instances which might practically illustrate that important subject, and enable us hereafter to make the arguments of our opponents and ourselves the better understood by those seriously desirous of arriving at the truth, we were struck by the following specimen, which we conceive to be not wholly unconnected with this subject, and which we take from a volume already referred to in our pages, entitled "Indulgences granted by Sovereign Pontiffs to the Faithful, &c., collected by a Member of the Sacred Congregation of Indulgences in Rome, translated with permission of Superiors," published by Richard Grace and Son, 45, Capel-street, Dublin, p. 136. It is verbatim as follows:—

"Seventy-fifth Indulgence.

"In order to increase among Christian people a true devotion towards Jesus and Mary, by frequently invoking their most sacred names, together with that of St. Joseph, and to encourage the faithful to recommend themselves to their protection at the close of life, on which depends eternity, Pius VII., by a Decree of the Sacred Congregation of Indulgences, dated 29th of April, 1807, granted for ever an indulgence of 300 days each time they repeat devoutly, and with contrite heart, the following three aspirations to Jesus, Mary, and Joseph, and whenever they say one of these devout aspirations, he granted them an indulgence of 100 days. In both cases the indulgence is applicable to the souls of the faithful departed. It is recommended to make these short and pious aspirations of the soul in the day, and frequently during life, and to suggest them to sick persons in danger of death, which will afford them much spiritual comfort:—

"Jesus, Mary, and Joseph, I offer you my heart and soul.

"Jesus, Mary, and Joseph, assist me in my last agony.

"Jesus, Mary, and Joseph, may I breathe forth my soul in peace with you."

We are aware that, according to Roman Catholic principles, supreme worship, by them called *Latria*, is

due to our Lord Jesus Christ, as one of the persons of the ever Blessed Trinity. A secondary and inferior worship—*Hyperdulia*—to the Blessed Virgin Mary, and a tertiary or lower worship—*Dulia*—to Joseph and other saints canonized by the Church. To keep ever in mind this important distinction is admitted to be necessary to avoid the mortal sin of idolatry; but here we have Pope Pius VII. recommending an act, including *Latria*, *Dulia*, and *Hyperdulia* in the same prayers, and even in the same sentence, solemnly recommending pious persons, in the hour of death, devoutly to offer up their *heart and soul*, not to the three persons of the ever Blessed Trinity—God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Ghost, each of whom is entitled to the same supreme worship—but to three persons, of whom, according to Roman Catholic doctrine, one only is entitled to supreme, and the others to different degrees of inferior worship.

Will any of our Roman Catholic readers explain to us how it would be possible to offer up our *heart and soul* to Jesus, Mary, and Joseph in three different ways, in the same devout aspiration, or tell us in what respect calling on Jesus, Mary, and Joseph at the hour of death to "assist us in our last agony," differs from the most solemn prayer which the human heart is capable of pouring forth to the Most High God? It would strike an ordinary mind, unclouded by metaphysical and scholastic theology, that it would be mockery to address to the Divine Redeemer of our souls in the solemn hour of death, anything short of the highest adoration—the supremest worship of which the human soul is capable, and that no language addressed to the Supreme Being could surpass in devout solemnity the simple and touching words—"I offer thee my heart and soul—assist me in my last agony—may I breathe forth my soul in peace with thee!" If such be not the prayer of *Latria*, we would earnestly request some of our friends to show us in what the worship of *Latria* consists. If it do amount to *Latria*, or an act of the highest devotion, we would then ask whether it be probable—nay, possible—that a dying man could use these prayers at the same moment, with three different feelings and emotions—*Latria* towards Jesus, *Hyperdulia* towards Mary, *Dulia* towards Joseph? Can one offer up his *heart and soul* in three different ways, in the same breath, to three different persons, differing so widely in dignity and nature? In sober sadness, we ask our Roman Catholic friends to tell us whether the blame lies at the door of the ignorant peasant who worships the worsted images of Joseph, Jesus, and Mary, and the itinerants who traffic in such wares, or at the door of Pope Pius VII., who offers, in the nineteenth century, 300 days' indulgence to every one who prays to Jesus, Mary, and Joseph in the way prescribed, and recommends them frequently, every day during their lives, and especially when dying, to look for spiritual comfort from such exercises?

We have looked into Cardinal Bellarmine on this subject, who distinctly lays it down (*De Sanct. Beatis. Lib. i.*, c. 17, p. 292—"Quemodo sancti invocandi non sint") that it is proved—1st, by Scripture; 2nd, by the practice of the Church; 3rd, by reason; and 4th, by the Fathers St. Augustine and Theodoret, that we should not expect or seek for anything from saints save that they should, by their *prayers*, obtain from God those things which are useful for us, which he tells us (in chapter xii., p. 287) is the inferior worship of *Dulia*, as distinguished from *Latria* or the worship of God, and *Hyperdulia*, the worship of Christ in his *human nature*, and the Blessed Virgin as the Mother of the Son of God. Now, is there anything in these prescribed prayers (to be rewarded by a 300 days' indulgence) or in the exhortation to use them to guard the suppliant against the danger of confounding the divine and human natures of Christ, and addressing him only in his *human nature* with *Hyperdulia*, or of falling into idolatry, by addressing the Blessed Virgin and St. Joseph with *Latria*, at the same moment with Jesus in his *divine nature*?

Did Pope Pius VII. recommend the dying to resort to Jesus in his Divine or in his human nature, to address him with *Latria* or mere *Hyperdulia*?

Could any man, however educated in scholastic subtleties, much less any simple-minded rustic, suppose that by the words, "Jesus, Mary, and Joseph, I offer you my heart and soul," it is not meant to convey a *devoting* of the heart and soul to *each* of those three persons, but merely, "Jesus, I devote to thee my heart and soul; and, Mary, I beseech thee to intercede for me with thy son Jesus, to accept my heart and soul; and Joseph, I invoke thee to pray for me?"

If we consult the written Word of God, we shall be at no loss to point out to whom we ought to offer our heart and soul, as the highest act of religious homage.

"These are the precepts," says Moses,* "which the Lord your God commanded that I should teach you . . . Hear, O Israel, the Lord our God is one Lord, and thou shalt love the Lord thy God with thy WHOLE HEART, and with thy WHOLE SOUL, and with thy whole strength." And when our blessed Lord himself was asked by a certain lawyer tempting him—"Master, what must I do to possess eternal life?" The answer was, "What is written in the law? How readest

* Jem is quite right about this fact. We know it ourselves on good authority. The Priest's Tariff had at that time been proclaimed in many counties in Ireland, when the monster meetings turned the minds of the people in another direction.

+ Jem is quite correct about this fact, too.

* Acts xiv. 5 and 19.

+ Acts xvii. 5.

* Deut. vi., Douay Bible.

thou?" He answering said*—"Thou shalt love the **Lord thy God** with thy **whole heart**, and with thy **whole soul**, and with all thy strength, and with all thy mind, and thy neighbour as thyself;" and he said to him—"Thou hast answered right; this do, and thou shalt live." Is not this true adoration? Is not this true supreme worship? "God is a spirit, and they that adore him must adore him in spirit and in truth"†.

Can any one dare, in the hour of death, to offer the affections of his *heart* and *soul* to any one but him who has thus plainly declared that **HE** requires the *whole heart* and the *whole soul* of his creatures, and that not from the lips only, but in spirit and in truth?

We ask again, in all sincerity and solicitude for the safety of men's souls, will they peril them (for the promise of a 300 days' indulgence), and hazard their immortal safety, by offering to any created being that heart and that soul which, if there be any truth in the Douay Bible, belongs to the Supreme God alone? and if not, what must be thought of Pope **Pius VII.**, who thus recommends and tempts them to do so, even in the awful hour of death, by offering them a 300 days' indulgence for each time they do so?

We take this opportunity of stating, that we have not lost sight of the subject of indulgences, nor shall we evade any argument which has been urged by Roman Catholic divines and controversialists in support of it. Possibly the instance above given may serve hereafter to assist us in practically illustrating the doctrine, and the uses to which it has been applied.

TO CORRESPONDENTS.

Several valuable communications are in type, but are necessarily postponed till our next, for want of room.

All letters to be addressed to the **Editor**, 9, Upper Sackville-st.

No anonymous letter can be attended to. Whatever is sent for insertion must be authenticated by the name and address of the writer, not necessarily for publication, but as a guarantee for his good faith.

We would request our valued correspondents, both Roman Catholics and Protestants, to limit the length of their communications, and not to discuss a variety of distinct topics in one letter.

Contributors of £1 per annum will be furnished with six copies, any of which will be forwarded, as directed, to nominees of the subscriber. Any one receiving any number of the journal which has not been paid for or ordered by himself, will not be charged for it, and may assume that it has been paid for by a subscriber.

The Catholic Layman.

DUBLIN, MARCH 1853.

It has been well said by an old writer, that "there is nothing which truth fears so much as to be prevented from appearing in public, and being exposed to the examination of all men." This must needs be because truth will bear close inquiry, and the more it is tried the more will the pure and solid gold be apparent to those who test and analyze it. As laymen and freemen, we heartily respond to this. We cannot believe that truth can be really promoted by the clergy being allowed to keep up a monopoly of knowledge to themselves, or by the laity being compelled to accept implicitly everything proposed to them relating to religious truth and duty without further inquiry, merely because the Church prescribes it; and we cannot but suspect that priestly advisers have some design not quite unconnected with their own aggrandizement, when they ask men to shut their eyes and ears against everything which does not directly favour their own views, or which tends to encourage freedom of judgment, and enlarged and accurate views of the grounds on which their faith is founded. Any Church or set of men which challenges close inquiry into their pretensions and claims, we think naturally deserves the respectful attention, at least, of every one who has sufficient self-respect and reliance on the reason and intelligence which God has given him, to reflect and judge for himself between truth and falsehood; while any Church which would deter men from inquiry, and invite them to close their eyes and ears against

all that is going on around them in the world of intellectual progress, would seem to us naturally to create a suspicion in the mind of any thinking man, that its leaders were conscious they could gain nothing, and might lose everything by too close a scrutiny into the foundation of their pretensions. The champion of truth must, we think, ever be bold and fearless, and anxious for the conflict, because he has proved and assayed his armour and his weapons, and can unhesitatingly confide in them. Distrust and timidity better become him who *doubts the soundness* of his cause, as he who anticipates defeat is never very solicitous for the combat. Have our Roman Catholic readers yet satisfied themselves why it is that their priests decline and evade the challenges we have so frequently urged on them to a fair and friendly discussion, and why they prefer maligning our motives and objects to meeting our arguments, and preaching the doctrine of implicit faith and blind obedience, to encouraging all, in the language of their own Bible, to "prove all things, hold fast that which is good?"—1 Thessal. v. 21 (Douay version). We can give but one explanation of it, which we will also do in the language of an old writer rather than our own—"I would have you to wit that the Church of Rome knew what they did when they invented the doctrine of an implicit faith and a blind obedience to all the Church's decrees; for if men should once dare to open their eyes and examine their assertions all their craft would be in danger to be set at nought, and the temple of 'Dominus Deus noster Papa' (as the Canon law calls him) would be despised, and his magnificence would be destroyed, whom so great a part of the world worshipped."*

We rejoice, however, to think, that the progress of light, knowledge, and education in these free kingdoms has released from the fetters with which priestcraft had so long enshamed them, thousands of thoughtful men, of vigorous minds and independent understandings, who know how to distinguish between subservience and respect, and can be inquirers without scepticism, and rational without being irreverent. Ignorant or timid men, of limited capacities and feeble judgment, *may*, and, perhaps, *must* ever be led by others, whether for good or for evil, but that is plainly no rule for those to whom God has given a larger amount of intelligence and capacity, and who feel themselves able to understand and weigh the force of evidence and argument, and who are not disposed to be blindly led, they know not whither, and cannot be happy, or feel themselves secure, without inquiring at least to the extent that will satisfy them that they are not trusting to blind leaders of the blind, which could lead ultimately but to the destruction of both. We would not urge or wish our readers lightly or hastily to make up their minds without the fullest and most careful examination of the important subjects of controversy between the two Churches. All we urge on them is, to persevere in their inquiries, and calmly and deliberately judge for themselves in so momentous a matter, on which no less a stake than that of their eternal happiness may depend. But when they have once made up their minds, on adequate grounds, as to the guides they should follow, let them do so in the spirit of intellectual freedom and enlightened conscientious conviction, and not in the contemptible servility of ignorance and superstitious fear. Priestly curses may be formidable, in a temporal point of view, when backed up by the physical force of the rabble; but to those who would satisfy themselves of their *spiritual* inefficacy, as well as sinfulness, we would recommend the perusal of the article on the *Fair of Loughmanagh*, which they will find in another column of our present number.

THE TOUCHSTONE.

(Continued from page 21.)

OBJECTION 40.—Protestants will not allow that water, or other creatures of God, may be sanctified, or made holy, by the prayers of the church.

Their Bible assures them they may—*For every creature of God is good, and nothing to be refused, if it be received with thanksgiving. For it is sanctified by the word of God and PRAYER.*—1 Tim. iv. 4, 5.

REPLY.—It is plain that this passage relates altogether to men's *ordinary diet*. The Apostle is warning Timothy against certain false teachers who pretended that there was some special virtue and holiness in celibacy, and in abstaining from certain kinds of food, "for bidding to marry and commanding to abstain from meats, which God hath created to be received with thanksgiving of them which believed and knew the truth. For every creature of God is good, and nothing to be refused if it be received with thanksgiving."

Protestants accordingly hold, as this Apostle teaches them, that all kinds of food—whether fish, flesh, or vegetables—being all alike "creatures of God," are indifferent in his sight, and are "sanctified"—that is, made pure—by our offering prayers and thanksgiving to Him for his gifts. As for any spiritual efficacy in sprinklings with what is called "holy water," it does not appear that any such thing was ever thought of in the times of the Apostles. And this the writer of the "Touchstone" seems to be aware of, by his bringing forward a passage which so manifestly has nothing to do with the matter.

OBJECTION 41.—Protestants teach, in the eleventh of their thirty-nine articles, that *we are justified by faith alone*.

Their Bible expressly teaches the contrary (St. James ii. 24)—*You see, then, how that by works a man is justified, and not by faith only.* 1 Cor. xiii. 2—*Though I have all faith, so that I could remove mountains, and have no charity, I am nothing.*

REPLY.—Protestants do not presume to deny or to keep out of sight what the Apostle Paul says, who most undeniably does speak of justification through faith.—See Rom. v. 1; iv. 1—8, &c. And as it is impossible that he and his brother-Apostle St. James could really have taught contrary doctrines, it is plain that they must be speaking of different kinds of faith. St. Paul certainly did not mean that there is any value in such faith as consists in mere belief, not bringing forth the *fruit* of holiness of life. For that, as St. James observes, is the faith of devils [demons], who "believe and tremble." Nor, again, could St. James be speaking of any good works—however beneficial to mankind, and so far good in themselves—which do not proceed from a right motive. For these would be no less the good works of demons, than the other is the faith of demons. It is "good thing" in itself to acknowledge Jesus as the Holy One; but those demons, whom He cast out, when they made this acknowledgment, did so because they were overruled by a superior power.

And, indeed, the very instance which St. James brings forward proves that he was speaking of good works springing from faith and love towards God. For Abraham's obedience evidently was the result of a firm faith. And the Apostle accordingly says—"I will show thee my *faith by my works*."

But neither by our own works nor by our own faith are we able to save ourselves. Eternal life, we are assured, is the gift of God through Christ; and He has Himself assured us that we can have no claim of *merit* in his sight: for "when ye have done all those things which are commanded you, say, we are unprofitable servants: we have done that which was our duty to do."

OBJECTION 42.—Many Protestants maintain, that the faith by which we are justified is, to believe, with an infallible assurance, that we are justified, and that we are of the number of the predestinate.

Their Bible expressly teaches the contrary, when it admonishes us (Philipp. ii. 12) to *work out our salvation with fear and trembling*. And when St. Paul tells us (1 Cor. ix. 27) of himself, that *he kept under his body, and brought it into subjection, lest, having preached to others, he himself should be cast away*. Can these people pretend to be more secure than St. Paul?

REPLY.—Questions about predestination have nothing to do with the differences between Protestant and Roman Catholic. For as Protestants are much divided among themselves on several of these questions, Roman Catholics are no less so. Augustine, whom they regard as a very eminent saint, was, it is well known, a zealous predestinarian; and so are many eminent Roman Catholic divines; while others of them have taught the contrary. But most advocates of predestination, Protestant or Roman Catholic, would admit that whoever is predestined to final salvation, is also predestined to work out his salvation by walking in God's commandments.

OBJECTION 43.—Many Protestants maintain that the commandments of God are impossible; and that no man ever kept them all.

Their Bible confutes this assertion, by the example of *Zacharias and Elizabeth*, of whom we read (St. Luke i. 6)—*They were both righteous before God, walking in all the commandments and ordinances of the Lord blameless.*

* Luke x. 25, 27, Douay Bible.

† John iv. 24, Douay Bible.

• Poole's Nullity of the Romish Faith, p. 18. Oxford, 1667.